
YESIM NAZLAR: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group call taking place on Wednesday, 7th of October 2020 at 14:00 UTC.

On our call today, we have Olivier Crépin Leblond, Jonathan Zuck, Eduardo Diaz, Gordon Chillcott, Lutz Donnerhacke, Bill Jouris, Sébastien Bachollet, Maureen Hilyard, Priyatosh Jana, Yrjö Lansipuro, Alfredo Calderon, Ricardo Holmquist, and Alan Greenberg, as well as Anne Marie Joly Bachollet, and Avri Doria.

We have received apologies from Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Roberto Gaetano, Satish Babu, Alberto Soto, Amrita Choudhury, Justine Chew, Vanda Scartezini, Joanna Kulesza, and from Javier Rua-Jovet.

And from staff side, we have Evin Erdoğan and myself, Yeşim Nazlar. And I'll also be doing call management. We are expecting Heidi Ullrich to join us shortly.

Before we get started, just a kind reminder to please state your names before speaking for the transcription purposes, and another reminder is for our real-time transcription purpose, as usual—and I'm just going to share the link with you here on the Zoom chat. And now I think it's time to leave the floor back over to you, Olivier. Thanks so much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Yesim. Welcome, everyone, to this Consolidated Policy Working Group call. Olivier Crepin-LeBlond speaking. And this is the one call that we have before ICANN #69 starts. In fact, ICANN 69 has

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

already started. This week is the preparation week. Next week is the community week and the week after is going to be the Annual General Meeting week.

So, this week is probably one of the last calls we have before the meeting. It's not the last one before the meeting takes place. And we have an interesting agenda with a few work group updates. I think just maybe a handful of them, maybe even less.

After that, we'll have the ICANN 69 ALAC and At-Large talking points with Jonathan Zuck who is going to take us through all of these. There is a Google Doc that's out there for comments. So hopefully we'll have some comments from last week.

Then we will continue with the policy comment updates with Jonathan Zuck and Evin Erdogdu, and this will have I believe two public comments for decision and one that will need to I think probably finish because it's closing in for the 15th of October. One about the label generation rule sets.

And then any other business after that. I might miss the second part of this call. I have to finish at the top of the hour, so I'll hand the floor over to Jonathan Zuck halfway through the call.

That's what we have today. Are there any amendments, additions, any suggestions to be made for amending the agenda?

I am not seeing any hands up. So I just need to add one more thing. There is captioning on for this call. That is working, I believe. But we do not have this week, we don't have interpreters. So I will ask people to

Speak a little slower for those people whose first language is not English. That is valid for me, too. I think primarily for me. So, thank you for adopting the agenda as it currently is on your screen.

We can therefore go to the next agenda item and that's of course the action items from last week. There were four of them. One is remaining to be fulfilled and that's for Alan Greenberg and Jonathan Zuck who have noted that the ALAC may wish to develop advice regarding the Expedited Policy Development Process to the ICANN Board.

I don't expect much to have happened this week. This is stuff that is likely to happen in the next few weeks. I'm not seeing Jonathan or Alan jump up and down. I gather I'm correct on this. So that's the action items. The other ones are all completed, which means we can move on.

And we are now entering agenda item #3, the work group updates. Now, traditionally, we've had updates from two main working group processes. One was the Expedited Policy Development Process and the other one was the Subsequent Procedures, the next round of new generic top-level domains.

Now, both of these processes have recently compiled a set of responses for public consultation and I don't know if there's very much to be said about them. Let's start first with the Expedited Policy Development Process, the EPDP, for registration data.

I note that Alan Greenberg is on the call and I should, therefore, ask him whether there is any update on this. Alan, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Not much. The GNSO did vote a week and a half ago or so to approve the full set of recommendations on the SSAD and sending them to the Board. We did make a short intervention in the meeting that ... Hold on, I'll get a summary of it. Just give me a moment. There we are. Largely pointing out that they were setting ... By approving the recommendations—I know it was clear at that point they were going to be approved—that they were setting a precedent in that, for the first time, they were recommending to the Board PDP recommendations to form a consensus policy—and that's a defined term in ICANN—for gTLDs that was based on a PDP Working Group not coming to consensus. And the whole concept of a consensus policy not based on consensus just doesn't make any sense.

So, we pointed that out. It of course didn't change the outcome. We also pointed out that several of the recommendations, even though they were deemed by the acting chair to—yeah, I guess acting chair—to have strong support but some objections, four out of the nine groups were objecting. And strong support says the majority—sorry, says most of the group. Certainly, if you count groups, five out of nine is not most. So clearly they were counting heads or equivalent to that. It was never specified. But since there was such an equal number of participants per group, that gives undue weight to certain groups over others. So, the whole thing was not very good.

The other aspect is there was another recommendation, another agenda item, to look at what's going to happen going forward. There was no decision made but it looks like they will reconvene the PDP to look at email addresses and legal versus natural. And on that, our intervention said that, "Thank you, it's very nice. But if it's going to have

an outcome that is different from the last stalemate, that we need a non-conflicted good chair.” And they were proposing three options— either they search for a chair, they appoint the liaison who is currently Rafik as the acting interim chair, or they take one of the EPDP members from among the group and they act as chair.

The latter two both end up in a position where the chair is not unconflicted. We said that we believe we need good facilitation and mediation and we need access to legal advice if we’re going to have an outcome, anything other than the stalemate that we had last time. We’ll see where that goes.

At this point, as Olivier mentioned, we do have to start thinking about advice to the Board. It’s essentially what I’ve just said and a summary of our previous comments. At this point, I don’t believe the formal comment period has opened yet. I presume the Board is waiting until after the ICANN meeting to start.

There is also a consultation that has been requested between the GNSO and the Board to look particularly on the financial issues but potentially on other issues and I don’t think there’s any merit in us formally putting in a comment before we see what all the cards on the table are. So, I think we have some background work to do, but at this point, we’re not going to start drafting until we know exactly what it is we’re commenting on. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. There’s a couple of hands up in the queue. So, first is Jonathan Zuck.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier, and thanks, Alan, for that summary. My question is just a practical one for ICANN 69 and that is do you believe that there will be fora in which this is getting discussed within ICANN 69? And if so, where?

And I suppose one of those might be the public forum for the Board. Do you plan on making an intervention then or should we as a group plan on an intervention taking place during the public forum, with respect to the EPDP?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't ... There may well be comments on it. I'm not sure we have anything to say that ... My answer is no. I don't foresee a real opportunity that would have a lot of merit at this point. Others may differ.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Yeah. Just because we're talking about talking points and participation. I wanted to get your perspective.

ALAN GREENBERG: Certainly, if the issue comes up, we have comments. We can reiterate them and say them in a public forum instead of in writing. I'm not foreseeing a lot of discussion of this. I don't think it's on the agenda anywhere. It could come up in public forum meetings. I'm not expecting it, but I may be surprised.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [Great]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thank you for this, Alan. Actually, question regarding the public forum. Doesn't the Board usually segment the public forum on specific topics and might it, therefore, segment one part of the public forum to deal with the EPDP?

ALAN GREENBERG: If they do, then clearly we may want to reconsider quickly. I haven't seen a list of what the topics are. My recollection is there's only one public forum instead of two this time, so I think it's going to be a little bit more restricted.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. I think we might need to ... Let's have an action item to be proactive on this and check in advance so we don't end up with just three days to go and suddenly we realize that there is going to be a topic in the public forum about this. If we're given a chance to speak, let's seize the chance on that. So, the action item is for staff to check with the Board staff on the agenda for the public forum, what the format will be, etc.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. Jonathan again for just a second.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, go ahead, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Marita Moll is next in the queue, and I guess before she speaks I wanted to also ask her a question because I believe she's the keeper of our agenda with our meeting with the Board, which is also another possible opportunity for bringing up the EPDP, if we think that's appropriate. So I just wanted to put that into your radar, Marita, as you raise whatever issue you were going to raise just now. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: On that, that would certainly have merit in mentioning it, but I would make it clear that we're not looking for input from the Board. They've got a lot of work to do and I don't think they're in a position to say what they think at this point. So I wouldn't put them in an awkward position of asking them that. But if we want to take it as an opportunity to register our displeasure over the GNSO passing non-consensus policy as consensus policy, that would be a reasonable opportunity.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan, for this. Next is Marita Moll.

MARITA MOLL: Hi, Marita Moll for the record. Can you hear me okay?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Pretty well, yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, ma'am.

MARITA MOLL: Okay, thanks. Yeah. Jonathan, whether or not to bring that up at the Board meeting. We were really going to sort of [spin] out the whole stuff about the multi-stakeholder evolution and we kind of slotted in a number of speakers. Well, you know this because you're one of them.

Not sure how that would fit in exactly into the way we structured discussion, and as Alan already said, will [now] be putting them in a pretty awkward position. So we want to be careful about that, I think.

My question, though, is really about the business of counting groups or counting heads. It boggles the mind that this is not actually ... This is actually an open question and that nobody is sure which way is correct. We just [had] the PDP 3.0. I'm not that familiar with it. I've attended a couple of sessions. I don't know whether there's anything in there that resolves or speaks to this issue but I'm wondering whether anybody else on the call has anymore information about whether there's some [inaudible] between that because I can't believe that [inaudible] ... I know it's true, but it's hard to believe that in a group that's been operating under a consensus policy all this time that is still a question that—an issue that could be questioned. [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: I can address that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks. Please, go ahead, Alan. Marita asked the question I wanted to ask, so yes, go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Remember, it was just a few years ago that we came out with these words. Until then, we bat around the term consensus. Every group in ICANN has a different definition of consensus. The GAC, for instance, says consensus is someone says something and nobody formally objects. That's consensus.

The ccNSO, if I remember correctly, defined consensus as unanimity. I may be wrong on that but I believe that's the case. The GNSO defines consensus using these not definitions, but descriptions, which are then subject to interpretation. The ALAC tends to use 80% as consensus, when we use the term. So, everyone has a different definition and it's quite clear that each group defines consensus in its own way.

So, that being said, the GNSO one ... Remember, this is one of the first groups in recent history where there were formal groups participating in the PDP. Normally, anyone who wants to show up can show up. So there's not even the concept of identifying all of the groups so you don't even know how many of them are.

Moreover, in a regular PDP, up until now certainly, you could have many people coming from one per group. You can't count each group as being equal because some of the groups are individual people who have no

substantive weight within the issue and they're simply there speaking on their own behalf. Others may be representing large groups. It's quite a controversial question how the GNSO and how other groups respond to public comments when one public comment may come from a single person, the other may come from a group of 1000 people. Do you weigh those comments differently? And that's not a given.

In the case of the EPDP, we know there were specifically nine groups participating. They were given very different components of number of representatives on the PDP ranging from two to six. Therefore, how do you count them? It's not intuitively obvious. And in the case of these decisions, the answer from the acting chair was, "Well, it's not just a matter of counting the number of groups. It's more complex than that." But he didn't elaborate any further. Clearly, he was giving more weight to some groups than others. It's subject to interpretation. The question is: did he violate the rules of the PDP or not? And the answer is it's not clear. It's up to the GNSO to make that decision and they implicitly made the decision that he did not by approving the recommendations.

So, it's not something that is settled and it's not going to be settled because you have to be really careful. If you say every group counts equally, especially when we may have a near infinite number of groups in any given discussion, you may not like that answer. So, it is more complex than just counting groups or counting heads. But it's not obvious what the answer is.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Next in the queue I believe is Hadia Elminiawi. Hadia? I know a little earlier we had a problem with Hadia's phone, so I'll turn to staff. Are you here?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yeah. I think now it's better. So, it's just a couple of thoughts. I definitely agree with Alan that the consensus must have been made on the basis that not all groups have [inaudible] weight and that's why we had this [inaudible] of strong support.

And then, in [relation] of bringing the matter up for the Board, we could certainly do that. However, I don't think the Board will be able to provide us with any concrete feedback as the council now adopted the final report and it is—or will be—submitted to the Board for its consideration. So we might bring up our concerns but that does not change the fact that the council actually has adopted this and is raising it to the Board for its consideration.

Then, in relation to ICANN 69, the only EPDP related session during the ICANN 69 meeting is the one in relation to the implementation of EPDP 1 recommendations and that's the Implementation Review Team session and I'm totally unaware of any other EPDP-related session during ICANN 69. Of course, raising the matter during the public forum is a possibility as well. And I think I do support it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Hadia. Alan? Or who is it?

JONATHAN ZUCK: It's Jonathan. Sorry.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hadia, in the implementation session, is there anything that needs saying from an At-Large perspective?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: No. From my perspective, no. No. There is nothing to be said there.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this. Go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm afraid I disagree with Hadia on that. The really substantive issue within the Phase 1 Implementation is whether the policy that was passed in Phase 1 essentially negated the thick WHOIS policy and the Board has taken the position that it did not and they explicitly said that.

Contracted parties have pointed out that basically the implementation says, yes, thick WHOIS could go ahead but everyone has to agree to it and that is not at all ... And that certainly has not happened.

So, although it didn't formally negate the policy ... And the GNSO has agreed that if you're going to formally negate a policy, you have to explicitly say so ... That for all practical purposes, because of the lack of agreement of contracted parties and because of [transporter] data flow issues, the policy is effectively negated and it's not clear what the way going forward is on that.

So, we have a policy which is still in effect but probably cannot be implemented if you accept the positions of a number of people. That's likely to be the substantive issue that comes up other than reporting on details. So if that comes up, I believe we would take our position that's in line with our previously stated positions that the thick WHOIS policy has not been obviated and we need to figure out a way to make sure that it's still honored. So ...

JONATHAN ZUCK:

So, Alan, our position is not a process one but really a substantive one that we want to continue to push for thick WHOIS or do we want to see it handled in a more procedurally sound way?

ALAN GREENBERG:

It's not clear what ... We have a paradox right now. We have a policy which cannot be implemented ... I mean, there are some people who

said because it's policy, it's legal. And that's nonsense, of course. It must be legal in its own right, not just because we formulated it as a policy.

However, the advice we got from legal counsel when reviewing this issue was that the arguments that took place during the thick WHOIS PDP were sufficient to justify the implementation of the policy.

So, our legal advice which normally was very cautious said that they believe that the legal arguments that were put forward during the PDP are sufficient to allow it to be put forward. The contracted parties are saying—and NCSG of course—are saying, no, it's not legal because we don't think it is, even though our legal advice implied that it was.

So, it's a substantive issue. It's a substantive legal issue. And perhaps a process issue of how do we implement it, ensuring that the transdata border flows---sorry, transborder data flows—are legitimate. And anyone who follows that part of the discussion knows that recently some laws were overturned and things that we thought were legal to send from Europe to the US are no longer legal. So, it's a complex issue but it's one that's still on the table. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Alan. I see Hadia has her hand up. Is that a new hand, Hadia?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes. I raised it when Alan was in the beginning of his talk about the thick WHOIS. My point actually was that the policy—and that's exactly what Alan said. The policy says that the thick WHOIS [should] actually be

implemented and [inaudible] to be implemented or not depends mainly on the legal advice that was received.

So, I guess our possible role here is to seek further legal advice, maybe different than that brought in by the contracted parties. If it comes different, then it should be implemented. But I don't see a role for us apart from continue seeking legal advice. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Hadia. I see in the chat a comment from Nadira Al-Araj suggesting that the consensus issue in the ... Well, she mentions it's a cross-community working group but here it's a GNSO working group policy development process. She mentions this should be raised to the Board to be addressed. Any comments on this, Alan and Hadia?

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't understand the relevance of the CCWG in this discussion, so I can't comment.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I think she meant the PDP. It says because there's so many players from around ICANN that are involved in the PDP, so this consensus issue is something that she mentioned or she suggests should be made with the Board.

ALAN GREENBERG: I think that's something we can raise in our advice when they're considering it. I don't think it's something that needs to be raised right now.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this. I am not seeing any other hands up. It's certainly a problem when we have a question of what is consensus. Yeah. This is probably not something we are going to resolve today.

I think we've probably touched on all the issues with regards to the Expedited Policy Development Process. The other usual standing item is to do with the subsequent procedures and that has just had a statement that has been sent over to the public consultation process, public comments. Staff I understand for the group are currently compiling the responses and so on. So I think there is nothing to add to this. Justine isn't with us today because there wasn't very much to update on this.

Now, unless there's any other work group update that anybody would like to contribute to the discussion today we can probably move on. You see, we haven't put any maximum or minimum time for this item because we didn't quite know to expect, but it's taken a little bit of time for us to go through.

And I think it's time for us now to move swiftly on and look at the near future and that's the ICANN 69 virtual meeting that is already in place, already starting with this week, as I mentioned earlier. It's the preparation week. And for this we're also going to prepare for the At-Large and ALAC talking points and Jonathan Zuck is going to take us through this. Over to you, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Olivier. I'm going to recommend that we let Bill Jouris go first, because this topic, like the previous one, is kind of open-ended and doesn't have a natural length to it and I don't want to squeeze Bill Jouris off the call by going too long. And because that comment is due shortly, I'd love to give him the floor and deal with that comment right away since it's the one that we have that's still very present.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: All right. Thanks very much for this, Jonathan. That's a good point. Well, let's then jump to the policy comment update. So, we'll do the policy comment updates and we'll do Bill Jouris [inaudible] label generation rule sets for the second level. Then, after that, you'll have all the time you can spend on the At-Large talking points.

So, agenda item 5, Jonathan and Evin. I'm not sure how you wish to do this one, whether they will go through it.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Is Bill on the call?

BILL JOURIS: Yes, I am.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: He is, yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, okay. Do you want to take us through anything? I just want to make sure you had the opportunity to ask any final questions, etc., and to promote the document and tell people where to find it and make comments, etc., before its submitted very soon. So I don't know how you want to handle that but I just wanted to give the talking stick to you.

BILL JOURIS: Thank you very much, Jonathan. I didn't receive any negative feedback after the presentation I did. So what I've basically done is [wrap words around the four] areas of concern that I had. The link to the statement is in the chat. I hope you all will look it over, and if I stated something that you feel is not what we want to say, put in comments. That's really all I have. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: What kind of deadline do you want to set for that, so that you have the time to incorporate the comments? Because we need to submit it for an ALAC vote. Just trying to work backwards on the timeframe. Presumably, we'll want to give the ALAC a few days to look over the final document and vote on it.

BILL JOURIS: I don't know how the process works well enough to be able to answer that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Evin says we should launch the vote on Monday for submission on Thursday. Let's say that if people have comments, that they make them within the next two days.

BILL JOURIS: That will work for me. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right. Thanks, everyone. Please take a look at this document and see if it all makes sense to you. As Bill said, he's just captured the things that he presented via PowerPoint before, so there shouldn't be anything too controversial in it. But do take a look at it if you get the chance.

Okay, thanks. We can zip back to the talking points because I think that's all that's left on the agenda. Is that right, Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: There are actually two items for decision on the policy.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, let's see that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: One is the proposed amendment to the DotJobs registry agreement. If you want, I can take us very quickly through this. DotJobs is a top-level domain that was established a while ago and it's asking to amend it's

registry agreement with a number of things including a chance of sponsor from a third-party entity to a different registry operator. It's also looking at having revised language reflecting the retention of a concept of an independent HR council that will act in the interest of DotJobs. It looks at simplification and modifications of some specification language and also additions to the registry restrictions dispute resolution.

In general, the ALAC does not comment specifically on amendments to a specific top-level domain, except of course if it has major implication for the public interest. So that's the first thing that's currently up for consultation.

And the second topic is the recommendations for early warning for root zone scaling and that's public consultation run by the office of the CTO (Chief Technical Operator) and the SSAC and they are looking at ... It's all about root zone scaling, basically. Having more and more roots and having a number of technical points relating to the root server system and how it can scale up and withstand the new threats that one has to face today, including the denial of service attacks, etc. The abuse you now see that there might have not been a few years ago. So, for those people that are technically inclined, this is an interesting topic to read about.

I'm not sure if we can decide today on whether the ALAC should comment on it or not. I'll leave it over to you, Jonathan, to shepherd this.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. Thanks, Olivier. Do we have a volunteer that would be willing to take a look at this and come back to us with an assessment about whether or not they believe we should comment on it? Do you have a thought on that, Olivier, an initial impression from it in terms of what the ... Are you familiar with what the amendment says?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Jonathan. I'm not, unfortunately. I just had a quick read of it before this call since it's just popped up on our radar. There still is plenty of time. The deadline for the DotJobs registry agreement is the 16th of November and the one for the early warning for root zone scaling is the 23rd of November so we can revisit this later on. And they are not huge consultations which require hundreds and hundreds of pages to read.

What I might suggest is to fire an email off to our technical issues working group for the early warning on root zone scaling, so we'll have some of technical people on there and then see if anybody wishes to step forward and have a good read of this. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible] take a look at it. So if you would, take a look at the amendment and come back just prepared—not with a draft of anything, just a slide or two with your thoughts on whether this is something we should take up. And if so, what you think might be the At-Large position on that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I note that [inaudible] has said he can take a look. [Abdulkarim]?

JONATHAN ZUCK: That's right.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah. I will take a look and see, then I'll get back next week.

JONATHAN ZUCK: That'd be great. I don't know if we'll have a meeting next week. I guess that's another topic for discussion. So, it may be something where you circulate something on the email list after you've read it, too, that just says, "Hey, this is basically what the amendment does. Here's why I think it matters to us (or doesn't matter to us)." And if it does matter to us, "Here's what I think we should say." Something like that.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay, that's fine.

JONATHAN ZUCK: All right, great. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So, Jonathan, I think I can firmly hand the baton over to you for the rest of this call, for the At-Large talking points.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

All right. Excellent. Thank you. So, what we have done in the past is we have ... Here, I'll make myself visible, I guess, to talk to you. What we have done in the past is have a session at the beginning of the ICANN meeting where we go over these talking points and the schedule of sessions that will be taking place during the ICANN meeting. This is a little bit complicated by the three-week structure of the current meeting, so we'll see how this process pans out.

But in this particular case, we don't have on our schedule a time to go over these for the broader group and to make assignments to folks to cover different meetings. So I will probably try to do that on the list maybe with a Google Doc or something like that that lists the different sessions and invite people to sign up for a particular session to say that they're willing to attend the session, to make an intervention if an opportunity presents itself and to report later during the wrap-up about how that session went.

So, this is less about the ones that we're running because the moderator or the At-Large in charge person can make that assessment. This is for the other meetings taking place that hopefully we will all be attending and covering when there are issues being discussed that are relevant to either the ALAC as an organization or to individual end users. So, that is ... I think the plan is to do that offline this time because we didn't do one ... We don't have a session scheduled to do that.

But what we are doing again is creating a talking point document that right now exists in draft form and is basically a revised version of the one from ICANN 68. And what I wanted to do was just put in front of you some ideas for what things we might want talking points about and

what those talking points might be and have a conversation with you all about what that would look like for the current ICANN meeting. So, next slide.

So, there is the perennial topic of DNS abuse and this is one of our campaign issues that we are remaining engaged on. This is a somewhat different ICANN meeting for us in that we are not being as aggressive of the policy side of the DNS abuse issue but more so beginning our own internal conversations about how we will complete our end user education campaign that we committed to during ICANN 67.

So, during ICANN 67, we talked about having a two-pronged approach to DNS abuse. One is to constantly sound the alarm within ICANN and to try and bring about reforms to contracts, reforms to the best practices of contract compliance, etc., and we continue to do that. Those conversations are ongoing.

And there is a DNS abuse [plenary] that we are involved in organizing, but it is a very difficult one because there's a major disagreement between the contracted parties and everyone else in terms of the scope of the issue. So, there's an SSAC report that's coming out prior—if it hasn't come out already—prior to the meeting that details some steps that the community as a whole might take to address DNS abuse and that's likely to be the outline structure for the DNS abuse plenary.

We are moderating a panel just on communications and data access since the implementation of the temp spec. So, this is a potentially volatile session where the data requestor community, if you will—they've come to be known as the requestor caucus—and the contracted

parties are going to share their experiences with data in terms of attempts to get at data, whether those attempts were proper or not and whether or not the contracted parties were able to respond in an efficient way. So there is going to be some discussion in that context.

But our internal discussion is going to be about an education campaign, so that's why the DNS abuse talking points are a little bit different than they have been in the past.

One talking point is rather than just talking about DNS abuse in general being on the rise, there's a recent report out of Microsoft—and I will share the link here momentarily in the chat—called the Defense Report that suggests that ransomware in particular is on the rise and that that is one of the types of cybercrime that seems to be even more pervasive during the past year.

So, we can say that ransomware is definitively on the rise rather than just the abstract DNS abuse, because the statistics from DAAR, at least at this point, contradict the idea that DNS abuse generally is on the rise. But we know that ransomware is.

The At-Large is committed to individual user education. As much as we want to see changes in policy, we also know that part of the solution to this is getting individual Internet users not to click on bad attachments and that's a big part of the DNS abuse problem. Don't click on bad attachments. Don't click on misspelled URLs that look too good to be true, FacebookUserPrizes.com or something is probably not something you should click on.

So, doing some education around that is something that we're committed to and I think it's a very important talking point because, right now, the contracted parties are feeling, for lack of a better word, targeted on this DNS abuse issue, and to some extent that's legitimate—that we want to see them do more than they are. But they feel like they're doing a lot. They feel like the problem has not been well scoped by advocates and I think that's something that we need to take responsibility for.

But I think it's also important to mention the things that we're going to be trying to do to improve this problem instead of always talking about what they should do to improve this problem. So this education campaign is a big part of our efforts in that regard.

A third point that I think is also important is that most of our sessions on DNS abuse have not been focused on the people at ICANN meetings. There's a few kind of bad actors—Goran has said that it's just four of them but it may be more or less—where there's such a high percentage of abusive registrations or domains that are being used specifically for DNS abuse, that it's clear that there are some contracted parties—not very many of them—that are sort of the low-hanging fruit. They are the folks that Contract Compliance should deal with directly and potentially take away their accreditation. So we have been focused on those bad actors far more heavily than we have on trying to improve the best practices of the people that we talk to every day at ICANN meetings, like Tucows and GoDaddy, etc. But not out of the woods entirely but that our area of focus really has been the undeniably bad actors.

So, finally, the At-Large supports the SSAC recommendations. Laurin has mentioned in the chat ... If you could take two minutes to talk about what those recommendations are, Laurin, then that would help this group as well if you're prepared to do that. Laurin, are you able to unmute? I guess not.

There is an SSAC report coming out. It should be coming out very soon and we will share those recommendations as well on the mailing list.

I see that Alfredo has uploaded the Microsoft Defense report. That's a very good one. Then there's a recent report from Europol that Judith has mentioned. Hopefully, Judith can find that link and include it in the chat as well. Are there any questions on the DNS abuse? We're trying to shift focus a little bit and put more of the ... Shine more of a light on our own activities this time around to give the contracted parties a little bit of a breather and say, "Look, we're going to do what we can to mitigate this problem as well." Okay, next slide since I don't see ... Oh, wait, let me scroll up—sorry—just to make sure there aren't hands. Okay, I don't see hands.

So, EPDP and GDPR compliance. We had a conversation about this, so I'm actually inclined to remove this from the talking points because as Alan and Hadia have said, it's unlikely that this is going to be a topic of discussion in sessions around ICANN 69, but instead when the Board gets the opportunity to focus on this directly, we will reach out to them via advice. So I may remove it from this particular draft of the talking points. Next slide.

Human rights. And I don't know if Joanna is on the call. It doesn't look like it. But Joanna is going to be running a session in conjunction with the NCSG on the Human Rights Impact Assessment which was a recommendation that came out of the CCWG Workstream 2 back in 2016. And there's some question about how that process is going and what it has focused on. But we are going to try to have open minds and participate with the NCSG in a panel discussion and talk about human rights impact assessments.

We certainly support the ideal of an assessment but we do have two ongoing concerns, one being the rights of non-registrant humans, non-registrant individuals, which is always something that we raise; and also that there are, in say the United Nation Declaration of Human Rights, some rights that speak to some of the areas of concern in terms of public safety, protection of property, etc., freedom from identity theft that need to be taken into consideration anytime there's a human rights assessment.

So, it can't be a human rights assessment that's just the impact on registrants and it can't be an assessment that's just on freedom of speech and privacy. Are there questions or comments about those talking points? Okay, great. Next slide.

Subsequent procedures. As Olivier mentioned, Justine is not on the call and it's not clear exactly what conversations will be happening with respect to subsequent procedures. Cheryl is an apology for this call as well.

But it's safe to say that, if we had to summarize what our comments on subsequent procedures focused on, it is that we continue to be concerned about setting real goals for applicant support and community involvement in a future round.

So, the Subsequent Procedures Working Group has postponed some things for implementation that we think really need to still be part of policy development, and that is the actual setting of goals for some of these areas, like applications from underserved regions, applications from communities etc., because without objectives there won't be anything against which to measure the success of a new round. So we remain concerned about communities and applicants from underserved regions.

We also remain somewhat concerned about geo-names. We didn't have a real definitive outcome from our survey exercise but there does appear to be a strong desire among the At-Large to at least put a notification system in place for the GAC in case a string is applied for that would apply to a country that is within the GAC, so that they can have the opportunity to be notified and raise an objection more clearly as early on as possible. So that notification system is something that we're still supporting.

Then, finally, we remain concerned about private auctions and the possibility of gaming the application process. So we really support going the extra step and eliminating private auctions and making sure that everything happens through what's known as a Vickery Auction in which people, when they apply, they actually submit their bid alongside their application so that they don't have an opportunity to game the system

later. They have to truly value the string for which they're applying up front.

We also support the notion of there being a multiplier for applicants for Applicant Support that allows them to bid higher than the actual dollars they have to spend on the application.

So those are some issues that we've focused on is making sure that we have a good and strong infrastructure in place before any new round happens and that we are careful about the types of applications that get produced in a new round. Evin, you have your hand up.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thanks, Jonathan. I just wanted to flag that Laurin noted in the chat that he's back and he can comment on SSR-2 with respect to DNS abuse, but I don't know if we want to go back to that or go back later. But just wanted to flag that.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

I'm happy to have him talk about that because I know that there is an SSR-2 meeting coming up. In fact, there's one coming up this week. Is that right, Laurin? Go ahead and take the microphone.

LAURIN WEISSINGER:

Yes. I hope you can all hear me, yes?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Yes.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Yes, you can hear me. Okay.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, we can.

LAURIN WEISSINGER: Sorry. I'm not sure what's going on with [inaudible] today. Yes. We are actually having a call on SSR-2 implementation ... Sorry, implementation. Finishing the report in one hour from now. So, if you're interested, please come along. It will be a quick status report and then there will be more [content] coming.

So, with abuse, we have done a lot of work on this over the years this has been active, some before I was even part of the team. So, essentially, what we're focusing on a lot is essentially how contract works and how ICANN Compliance could play a role in anti-abuse measures. As Jonathan mentioned, there are certain [inaudible] that essentially always come back and that stay a problem for a long time.

The big issue we had as a review team was talking about this strategy against abuse comes down to what can be recommended to support. What if policy was required, a PDP? So, this is I think just a tough area to deal with because of that. And we also had discussions about what is consensus before? So it is also something where different constituencies, different parties, do disagree considerably, particularly when it comes to the Contracted Party House.

I think it would take too long to give you more details at this point. Like I said, join us in an hour. I'm also very happy to join with more details, for like the session that ICANN that was being discussed or whatever else works.

But knowing what ALAC is doing on abuse and following that, I feel that it is pretty much aligned I think with ALAC interests and ALAC positions. I'll stop here.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Laurin. If you all switch in the upper-right hand corner, switch your view to swap video and shared screen, then you'll see my video bigger than my slides and you'll see that I have shared something about the session that's coming up in an hour. So that's here in the schedule and if you want to check in on the SSR-2 session.

All right. Any questions for Laurin or me about that? Are there questions about subsequent procedures? Okay. All right. Thanks. Next slide.

The next issue is a virtual meeting. This is a topic that's going to be discussed I think generally in a lot of different fora, so when we get the opportunity to do so, I think we want to express appreciation for the subsidy that the ICANN Board instituted that, in many respects, of particular interest to the At-Large. I know it's not perfect and doesn't deal well with the fact that it's a three-week meeting and there's other issues with it, but I think it's a great first step that they've entered into this realm of subsidies for additional bandwidth for participants.

So, when you get the chance to talk to a board member or you see this topic of virtual meetings come up, take the opportunity to be thankful for this pilot project of bandwidth subsidies so that it keeps growing and growing and becomes a regular part of what ICANN does for its larger meetings.

Secondly, there's another pilot that's taking place and I might ask ICANN staff who have yet identified what sessions this applies to, but another pilot that is happening for ICANN 69 is simultaneous streaming of the Zoom meeting out to YouTube. And this again is of particular interest to At-Large and was a request by the Technology Taskforce that was passed by Maureen to Goran and the rest of the meetings team.

The importance of YouTube streaming is a couple of things. One is, with the greater use of cameras, there's an increased use of bandwidth by Zoom, and so those that have lower bandwidth and have trouble with Zoom will have even more trouble with Zoom even though cameras are important. So, having an alternative way to watch the Zoom meeting rather than just being on the phone is critical.

So, YouTube offers a way to essentially take all those cameras and turn them into a single feed and that makes it much easier and much smoother for someone with low bandwidth to be able to watch this session as it takes place. It's got a delay associated with it. It's not perfect. But they could turn off all of the video and just comment via Zoom. They could come into Zoom after there's—or do their comments via phone. But they should be able to watch the session more easily. And also YouTube has servers all over the world and does better caching than Zoom does as well. So, this is important.

So, there are at least two sessions that are going to be streaming on YouTube. Alfredo says that they're mentioned in the schedule. If anybody can say what they are, what I'd really like to say is that, in addition to expressing our appreciation for this, we should do everything we can to get people to look at it, too, so that it looks like there's good numbers of people that are streaming on YouTube and justifying further experiments with simultaneous streaming on YouTube.

So, tell your friends to get on to YouTube and watch the sessions and let's make sure that we reach out to everybody that normally needs a call-out or doesn't normally get in via Zoom that they know which sessions are going to be available via YouTube so that we have a strong participation in the pilot.

So, again, we'll circulate this on the list when we determine the exact sessions. We'll have to just look through the schedule to see what they are. So, those are two things that we're appreciative of.

We still remain impatient for some additional tools. We had hoped to be able to use Zoom breakout rooms for this meeting, and because of training and staff availability, we're not able to and that's unfortunate because we really want to have—recapture some of the things that we were able to do in a face-to-face meeting where we separated in different parts of the room with a whiteboard and sticky notes and brainstorming of smaller groups and then came together and reported on that. And we want to replicate that process and it's breakout rooms that allow us to do that. Again, this isn't anything to be nasty about, but

we just wanted to keep a constant hum about the desire to have Zoom breakout rooms.

We also are going to be, during Ricardo's session, looking at just a demo of Google Jam Boards which are something that are used inside of ICANN now. So that's something that we want to make more use of for our meetings as well because that allows us to do the sticky notes and things like that in a virtual environment. So those are two things we're looking for.

We continue to try to push IT for the incorporation of dreaded discussion tools. Slack is already in use by staff, so we want to get access to Slack or Loomio which is the thing we did a pilot project of which is software specific to consensus building. So either one of these will allow us to better organize our offline conversations, so that everything doesn't need to be resolved during a Zoom call.

Then, finally, greater use of machine translation where appropriate, where we don't have access to the amazing interpreters that we have available to us during the off hours, etc. Getting permission to incorporate some of these excellent outside tools that, while not as good as the interpreters we have, we would be using them today, for example, because we don't have interpreters. So, getting permission and authorization to use some of these machine language translation tools is something that we want to keep pushing for as well.

So, those are the talking points about virtual meetings and the improvement of our COVID-era discussions that hopefully make sense

to everyone and I'm happy to take questions. Sarah, you have your hand up.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: If you can add me to the list. Sebastien.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, Sebastien, I'll make a note. Sarah, go ahead.

SARAH KIDEN: Hi, everyone. Thank you, Jonathan, for the presentation. I just have a question about YouTube streaming. I know that some of our meetings we are required to attend, so attendance is captured. I just wanted to ask how this will work or is it only for main sessions or sessions that don't really require attending? Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Sarah. Your attendance is not captured via YouTube, probably. All that we'll see is the number of people that are streaming it. I guess if you make a comment on YouTube to say that you're there, we might be able to capture that you're watching something via YouTube.

I think our expectation will be that people will get onto the Zoom call via phone and use YouTube as a way to keep track of the visuals, even though there's some delay. So, you might mute the phone, watch a presentation, then unmute the phone to ask a question, for example. So, your attendance can still be noted via your phone participation, but

that your ability to watch the meeting will be enhanced by YouTube. I think that's the idea. None of this is set in stone but I think that's the way we're thinking about it. I hope that helps. Sebastien, you're next in the queue.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you, Jonathan. This is Sebastien Bachollet speaking from [inaudible]. I just wanted to come back to your last point about interpretation. I think, yes, we have other requests that I think also we might say that we are also thanks to staff to have organized more language to be translated tools which seems to be improving the way to participate to the meeting. That's a good point, too.

I have a request. Usually, when we are in a country, the language of the country is taking care of. I didn't have any answer for that but I ask the [inaudible] will be taking care of as we are even [inaudible] virtually in Germany.

I think, even if we are virtual, I think it's something we need to be taken into account, because once again, when it's a country with a specific language, it's taken care locally usually.

I think that all the tools that you are using and suggesting, yes, I can [inaudible] to incorporate them. But [inaudible] and I think it's a good way to go. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Sebastien. And that's an excellent point. We should show appreciation for the expanded interpretation over above and beyond

what we had with ICANN 67 because, again, I think the At-Large in particular is interested in expanded participation of more people and more languages.

I think it's also a good point that you raise, Sebastien, that normally the language of the home country is added to the list of interpreted languages and that should probably still be the case, especially since we are in fact maintaining the time zones, particularly in an effort to facilitate greater involvement in the host country. So having interpretation of that language I think is important.

Staff may be able to comment on this. I thought that there was going to be some German interpretation. I thought I remembered somebody answering your question on this on another session. Heidi, yeah, please go ahead.

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Hi. Apologies, Sebastien. I thought that we had gotten back to you on that. We did immediately write to Language Services with the request for German but they informed us that currently that is not a language that is supported by Language Services. It's just not available at this point. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Okay. Thanks, Heidi. So, that may be another area then that we need another reason to push for supplementing Language Services with machine language translation in certain cases. Maureen Hilyard, the big boss, has her hand up.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Oh, thank you. Yes, I might make an intervention at this early hour. In the chat, I've really been pushing that there is a survey that's going to be coming out and it's all about ICANN meetings and I really, really think it's important that all these issues are raised by everyone who responds to the surveys, so that they see how important it is to us within At-Large about what we want, what we need, what works for us and also, especially the interpretation we really need to push as well.

So, I'm just making that point because I understand that I sent out our feedback into ... We only had one person actually commenting on the actual design of the survey, just making sure that all the sorts of questions that we wanted [inaudible] were in that survey and Justine provided some comment. So, they're going to collate all the input that come from all the different constituencies and then put out the survey itself. So, please, when it comes out, please respond and put these things into it, please. It's for virtual and face-to-face meetings.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Maureen. Very good points. When that survey comes out, we need to make sure our voices are heard. Christopher Wilkinson, you're up next in the queue.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Hi. Good afternoon, everybody. Just to pick up on the staff reply on the question of interpretation. My recollection is that the whole idea of

having ICANN meetings in different locations was to facilitate participation of the local communities in those places. Thus, we rotate.

I draw a distinction between the need to interpret everything that is being said into German, which indeed is a tall order if there's no infrastructure or practice, and indeed German, for better or worse, is not one of the ICANN [routine] languages. But the other way around, it's [as] important and I think German-speaking participants in Hamburg, literally, should be clearly allowed to speak in German and ICANN should provide interpretation from German into at least English, French, Spanish, and perhaps one or two other ICANN languages. That's a far more practical option, and indeed there are, in Europe especially, translation services which I would have thought would have accepted an outsourcing contract to provide such interpretation.

So, we need to be able to interpret active German participation but not necessarily interpret all the other working languages into German on this occasion. It's a compromise that is [inaudible] option. Thank you.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Christopher. We do have some German fluency among our staff, so perhaps it's something that, for a couple of our own sessions, we can try to arrange something. So I do know that, for example, you can assign ... I don't know how this would go. We'll have to see if there's something that we can pull off in a couple of our own sessions. But I think about the support of Language Services or the ability to connect to the Zoom meeting, it will be difficult for us to do something ad hoc. But we'll definitely take a look at it.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I take your point for the At-Large sessions, but more generally, for me the object of the exercise of being virtually in Hamburg is that the German-speaking community interested in our work and ICANN as a whole, not only ICANN At-Large, is that they should be able to express themselves, and if there's no interpretation out of German into at least English, French, and Spanish, then I think there's an element of self-[inaudible] here and that should be corrected urgently.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Staff are on the call. Heidi is on the call and we can ask again that they include German or find a way to include German.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Jonathan, I'm sorry. I think, at this point, we have a few days to go before the official start. There's no way. We're not offering At-Large staff interpretation. I want to make that very clear. If there are people who do wish to write in the chat in German, Gisella and I can certainly translate that. And I think, as Maureen noted, the best way forward for this issue is to note that in the forthcoming survey for the future meetings. Thank you so much. I'm sorry for any confusion on that point.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, thanks. I'm sorry. I was confused, too. I was reading different messages at the same time. But yeah, I think please communicate our displeasure because I think we raised this in the context of the meeting

in Kuala Lumpur as well. So it's not exactly a new issue that we're raising. Are there any other questions or comments?

I think that's it, then. We'll continue to work on the document version of these talking points and circulating them around on the email list and I will try to find a way to circulate a sign-up sheet for folks to commit to attending a session and reporting on how it went at the wrap-up.

That's it for me. Let's pass the microphone back to Olivier to wrap things up if he's here.

YESIM NAZLAR:

Jonathan, I believe Olivier had to leave and he just—

JONATHAN ZUCK:

All right. So, Olivier is checked out more so than usual. We've now reached the any other business part of our agenda. Is there anything that anyone needs to raise as any other business to the CPWG call? Evin, please go ahead.

EVIN ERDOGDU:

Thanks, Jonathan. I just shared in the chat that the ICANN 69 Policy Outlook Report, which was formally known as the Pre-ICANN 69 Policy Report is now available so please do check that out at the link down in the report and you'll see all the ALAC and At-Large activities as well. Thanks.

JONATHAN ZUCK: There was a policy readout session during prep week. Is that coming up today as well? Does somebody have that in front of them?

EVIN ERDOGDU: Let me check. I don't think ...

JONATHAN ZUCK: Or was it yesterday? Here it is. It's on Thursday. It's tomorrow. Sorry, I have it on my schedule is on Eastern Daylight Time, so it's six hours ahead. So, it is—sorry, four hours ahead It's 4:30 PM in UTC. 4:30 PM UTC is the pre-ICANN 69 policy webinar that is taking place tomorrow, October 8. Thanks for reminding us about that, Evin. So, everybody, check your prep week schedule and make sure—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think Jonathan is frozen maybe.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Can you not hear me anymore?

YESIM NAZLAR: I can hear you, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, I don't know what you mean by frozen. Did you hear that? I was saying about the session tomorrow?

YESIM NAZLAR: Yes.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Oh, okay. I don't know why somebody said that they thought I was frozen. Okay, do check the prep week schedule. There are some interesting sessions for prep week, including the policy readout.

Then, finally, our next meeting I think probably will be after ICANN 69. So probably won't have a meeting for the next two weeks. So that's why, Abdulkarim, we're looking for an email discussion from you sometime during the next couple of weeks since we won't have a meeting in time for you to be able to incorporate feedback and things like that. Anything else anyone wants to bring up?

Then I will say that this call is adjourned and please enjoy and participate in ICANN 69.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thanks a lot. Thanks, Jonathan.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you, all. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a great [inaudible].
Bye-bye!

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]